UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/814,069	03/31/2004	Mihai Florin Ionescu	24207-10108	5508

62296 7590 10/18/2007

GOOGLE / FENWICK
SILICON VALLEY CENTER
801 CALIFORNIA ST.
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041

EXAMINER	
MYINT, DENNIS Y	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2162	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/18/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/814,069	IONESCU, MLHAI FLORIN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dennis Myint	2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *09 July 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-12 and 14-36* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-12, and 14-36* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. In view of the Pre-Appeal Brief filed on July 9, 2007, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below.

John E. Breene

JOHN BREENE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

(John Breene)

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-12, and 14-36 have been considered but are not persuasive.

Applicant argued that *Doganata does not disclose whether at least a portion of a previously stored set associated with a search query is a valid search result set for the search query, and, if so, outputting the portion as a search of the search query* (Applicant's Pre-Appeal Brief, Page 2 lines 14-16).

In response, it is pointed out that Examiner is entitled to give claim limitations their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the specification. See MPEP 2111 [R-1] Interpretation of Claims-Broadest Reasonable Interpretation. During patent examination, the pending claims must be 'given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification.' Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 162 USPQ 541,550-51 (CCPA 1969).

With respect to the argument that *Doganata does not disclose whether at least a portion of a previously stored set associated with a search query is a valid search result set for the search query, and, if so, outputting the portion as a search of the search query* (Applicant's Pre-Appeal Brief, Page 2 lines 14-16), it is pointed out that Doganata in view of Simmons (U.S. Patent Number 7006588) teaches said limitation as follows.

Doganata teaches the limitation "determining whether (at least a portion of the previously) stored result set associated with the search query is a valid search result for

the search query" (Doganata, Paragraph 0024, i.e., *The present invention overcomes a problem with metasearch systems. As explained previously, a metasearch system sends a query to a multitude of information sources and the results are grouped and merged. The results are either arranged based on the original scores of the documents or are grouped based on the search engine. If the relevance of these information sources and their categories to the query is not known, the returned results are usually not satisfactory. By ranking the information sources, the present invention has the ability to return* ***a higher percentage of relevant documents*** *to the user in a faster fashion. In other words, embodiments of the present invention can determine that several information sources return more relevant documents. If these information sources are searched first, then the results placed highest in a list of returned documents will generally be more pertinent than the results obtained by the metasearch system;* and *Paragraph* 0022, i.e., *Furthermore, queries may be generated automatically from the keywords that represent a category to determine* ***the rank of*** *an information source. The keywords are sent to information sources and the returned results are analyzed for rankings. Each category is associated with a number of keywords, and the query is determined from the keywords corresponding to the category;* Note that by ranking of the results according their relevance and returning a higher percentage of relevant documents, the method of Doganata is essentially determining how large a portion of a category of searched results are relevant to the query. Therefore, the method is inherently determining whether a portion of the previously stored result set associated

with the search query is a valid result set for the search query. Also Note Paragraph 0039 of Doganata for this limitation, i.e., *document analyzer 150*); and

Doganata does not explicitly teach the limitations: "(determining whether) at least a portion of the previously (stored result set associated with the search query is a valid search result for the search query)" and "if the at least a portion of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is determined to be a valid search result set for the search query". *Limitations in parenthesis are taught by Doganata.*

On the other hand, Simmons teaches the limitations:

"determining whether at least a portion of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is a valid search result for the search query" and "if the at least a portion of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is determined to be a valid search result set for the search query" (Simmons, Abstract, i.e., *A received communication signal is stored in a memory and* ***portions*** *thereof are read from the memory and monitored to detect the sync signal. When a detected sync signal* ***is determined to be invalid****, previously read portions of the received communication signal, preferably beginning at a portion of the received signal immediately after a start of the detected sync signal, are again read and monitored to detect the sync signal;* Simmons, Column 6 Line 57 through Column 7 Line 6, i.e., *As will be apparent to those skilled in the art, sync signal detectors typically perform correlations between received data and an expected sync signal or pattern, such as the FS pattern described above,* ***to produce a probability output indicative of the likelihood that a portion of received data is a valid sync signal***).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Doganata to combine with method of Simmons, which teaches determining whether a portion/portions of data to be valid or not, so that the resultant method would determine whether at least a portion of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is a valid search result for the search query. One would have been motivated to do so in order to screen for valid data (Simmons, Column 1 Lines 44-55).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

2. Claims 1-3, 8-10, 17-19, and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doganata (hereinafter "Doganata", U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0220913) in view of Simmons et al., (hereinafter "Simmons", U.S. Patent Number 7006588).

As per claim 1, Doganata teaches the limitations:

(a) "receiving a search query" (Doganata, Figure 1: USER I/F 105 *and PERSONAL QUERY MANAGER 110 ;* and Paragraph 0022, i.e., *new user queries are generated, information sources are queried*);

(b) "determining whether the search query has been previously received" (Doganata, Paragraph 0033, i.e., ***If** the user has **previously used this query** within the context of "computer language",;* and Paragraph 0022, i.e., *The new user query may be based on **a previously entered user query**, which is given its own personal category or is related to a general category. **If the user enters a user query that has no corresponding category**, then it is beneficial to associate a category to the query. Once a category is associated with the query, then the corresponding keywords and the ranked list of information sources are also associated with the query;* and Paragraph 0036, i.e., *If there is no match,*);

(c) "if the search query has been previously entered" (Doganata, Paragraph 0033, i.e., ***If*** *the user has* ***previously used this query*** *within the context of "computer language"*),

(i) retrieving a previously stored result set associated with the search query" (Doganata, Paragraph 0022, i.e., *If the user has previously used this query within the context of "computer language," then* ***only "computer languages" is returned*** *as the category*); and

(ii) "determining whether (at least a portion of the previously) stored result set associated with the search query is a valid search result for the search query" (Doganata, Paragraph 0024, i.e., *The present invention overcomes a problem with metasearch systems. As explained previously, a metasearch system sends a query to a multitude of information sources and the results are grouped and merged. The results are either arranged based on the original scores of the documents or are grouped based on the search engine. If the relevance of these information sources and their categories to the query is not known, the returned results are usually not satisfactory. By ranking the information sources, the present invention has the ability to return* ***a higher percentage of relevant documents*** *to the user in a faster fashion. In other words, embodiments of the present invention can determine that several information sources return more relevant documents. If these information sources are searched first, then the results placed highest in a list of returned documents will generally be more pertinent than the results obtained by the metasearch system;* and *Paragraph* 0022, i.e., *Furthermore, queries may be generated automatically from the keywords that*

represent a category to determine ***the rank of*** *an information source. The keywords are sent to information sources and the returned results are analyzed for rankings. Each category is associated with a number of keywords, and the query is determined from the keywords corresponding to the category;* Note that by ranking of the results according their relevance and returning a higher percentage of relevant documents, the method of Doganata is essentially determining how large a portion of a category of searched results are relevant to the query. Therefore, the method is determining whether a portion of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is a valid result set for the search query. Also Note Paragraph 0039 of Doganata for this limitation, i.e., *document analyzer 150*); and

(d) "(if the at least a portion of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is determined to be a valid search result set for the search query), outputting the portion of the previously stored result set associated with the search query as a search result of the search query" (Doganata, Paragraph 0024, i.e., *the present invention has the ability to return* ***a higher percentage of relevant documents*** *to the user*).

Doganata does not explicitly teach the limitations: "(determining whether) at least a portion of the previously (stored result set associated with the search query is a valid search result for the search query)" and "if the at least a portion of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is determined to be a valid search result set for the search query". Limitations in parenthesis are taught by Doganata.

On the other hand, Simmons teaches the limitations:

"determining whether at least a portion of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is a valid search result for the search query" and "if the at least a portion of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is determined to be a valid search result set for the search query" (Simmons, Abstract, i.e., *A received communication signal is stored in a memory and* ***portions*** *thereof are read from the memory and monitored to detect the sync signal. When a detected sync signal* ***is determined to be invalid****, previously read portions of the received communication signal, preferably beginning at a portion of the received signal immediately after a start of the detected sync signal, are again read and monitored to detect the sync signal;* Simmons, Column 6 Line 57 through Column 7 Line 6, i.e., *As will be apparent to those skilled in the art, sync signal detectors typically perform correlations between received data and an expected sync signal or pattern, such as the FS pattern described above,* ***to produce a probability output indicative of the likelihood that a portion of received data is a valid sync signal***).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Doganata to combine with method of Simmons, which teaches determining whether a portion/portions of data to be valid or not, so that the resultant method would determine whether at least a portion of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is a valid search result for the search query. One would have been motivated to do so in order to screen for valid data (Simmons, Column 1 Lines 44-55).

As per claim 2, Doganata in view of Simmons teaches the limitation:

"wherein determining whether a search query has been previously received comprises comparing the search query to a list of previously received search queries" (Doganata, Paragraph 0033, i.e., ***If*** *the user has* ***previously used this query*** *within the context of "computer language"*). Comparing the search query to a list of previously received queries is inherent in said disclosure of Doganata, i.e., Paragraph 0033 of Doganata.

As per claim 3, Doganata in view of Simmons teaches the limitation:

"wherein determining whether at least a portion of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is a valid search result set for the query comprises determining at least **one of the following**: determining that a portion of the result set includes a change (Doganata, Paragraph 0046, i.e., *The information source analyzer 160 sends the ranked list 161 of information sources 180 to the linguistic library 170, along with the associated query and category. When the linguistic library 170 receives the ranked list of information sources 180 through link 161, the linguistic library 170 updates the category with the ranked list 161 of information sources 180, as described below in reference to FIG. 3*). Note that the category is updated because new set of results from the information source analyzer includes changes.

As per claim 8, Doganata in view of Simmons teaches the limitation:

"wherein the previously stored result set associated with the search query comprises at least one of the following: client-side articles, and network articles" (Doganata, Paragraph 0003, i.e., *text document;* Paragraph 0025, i.e., *a document,*).

As per claim 9, Sommerer in view of Simmons teaches the limitation:

" wherein the search query comprises at least one of the following: an implicit query, an explicit query, both an implicit query and an explicit query" (Doganata, Paragraph 0023, i.e., *Furthermore, queries may be generated automatically from the keywords that represent a category;* and Paragraph 0020, i.e., *The categories effectively allow* ***a user query to be expanded*** *into a number of keywords).*

As per claim 10, Doganata in view of Simmons teaches the limitation:

"wherein the previously stored result set associated with at least one of the following: a real-time event, a historical event, **an indexable event**, a non-indexable event" (Doganata, Paragraph 0039, i.e., *the document retriever 140* ***catalogs*** *results from each of the information source 180).*

Claim 17 is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it set forth the claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

Claim 18 is essentially the same as claim 2 except that it set forth the claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

Claim 19 is essentially the same as claim 3 except that it set forth the claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

Claim 24 is essentially the same as claim 8 except that it set forth the claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

Claim 25 is essentially the same as claim 9 except that it set forth the claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

Claim 26 is essentially the same as claim 10 except that it set forth the claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

3. Claims 4-7, 11, 14, 15, 20-23, 27, 30, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doganata in view Simmons and further in view of of

Baidya et al., (hereinafter "Baidya", U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0046311).

As per claim 4, Doganata in view of Simmons does not explicitly teach the limitation: "wherein determining whether at least a portion of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is a valid search result set of the search query comprises determining whether a preset amount of time has elapsed from a time associated with the result set".

Baidya teaches the limitation:

"wherein determining whether at least a portion of the previously stored result set meets at least one condition comprises determining whether a preset amount of time has elapsed from a time associated with the result set" (Baidya, Paragraph 0013, i.e., *automatically updating the information;* Paragraph 0020, i.e., *information previously stored in the InfoBase is automatically updated on a periodic basis;* and Paragraph 0023, i.e., *News information is updated daily by the BioNews Engine;* Paragraph 0050, i.e., *The Back-End processing Engine includes an automatic data-mining unit that periodically gathers information made available on the Internet to update the BioZak InfoBase industry database;* and Paragraph 0051, Paragraph 0052, Paragraph 0053, Paragraph 0054, Paragraph 0055, Paragraph 0057, Paragraph 0058, Paragraph 0059, Paragraph 0065).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Doganata in view of Simmons, which caches previously visited web content, to combine with the method of Baidya, which

updates caches of web content on periodic basis, so that the resultant method would determine whether a preset amount of time has elapsed from a time associated with the result set. One would have been motivated to do so because *there is a need for a method and system for automatically, or semi-atomically, categorizing and classifying large volumes of information and keeping the information up to date so that it is current and reliable* (Baidya, Paragraph 0012).

As per claim 5, Doganata in view of Simmons and further in view of Baidya teaches the limitation:

"wherein determining whether at least a portion of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is a valid search result set for the search query comprises determining whether a preset amount of time has elapsed from a date associated with the result set" (Baidya, Paragraph 0013, i.e., *automatically updating the information;* Paragraph 0020, i.e., *information previously stored in the InfoBase is automatically updated on a periodic basis;* and Paragraph 0023, i.e., *News information is updated daily by the BioNews Engine;* Paragraph 0050, i.e., *The Back-End processing Engine includes an automatic data-mining unit that periodically gathers information made available on the Internet to update the BioZak InfoBase industry database;* and Paragraph 0051, Paragraph 0052, Paragraph 0053, Paragraph 0054, Paragraph 0055, Paragraph 0057, Paragraph 0058, Paragraph 0059, Paragraph 0065).

As per claim 6, Doganata in view of Simmons and further in view of Baidya teaches the limitation:

"wherein retrieving a previously stored result set associated with the search query comprises at least one of the following: retrieving the result set from an optical disc, retrieving a result set from a hard drive, retrieving the result set from an external data storage medium, retrieving a result set from an external data storage reader, and retrieving a result set from a data store on the client-side" (Baidya, Paragraph 0151, i.e., *a BioZak InfoBase CD containing data and instructions*).

As per claim 7, Doganata in view of Baidya teaches the limitation:

"wherein receiving a search query comprises at least one of the following: receiving the search query from a user operating an offline client-side device, receiving the search query from a user operating an online client-side device" (Baidya, Paragraph 0515, i.e., *a BioZak InfoBase CD containing data and instructions;* and Paragraph 0151, i.e., *allows users to search for information* ***offline***).

As per claim 11, Doganata in view of Simmons and further in view of Baidya teaches the limitations:

"If the search query has not been previously received" (Doganata, Paragraph 0022, i.e., *The* ***new user query*** *may be based on a previously entered user query, which is given its own personal category or is related to a general category.* ***If the user enters a user query that has no corresponding category****, then it is beneficial to*

associate a category to the query. Once a category is associated with the query, then the corresponding keywords and the ranked list of information sources are also associated with the query)

(i) receiving a new result set (Doganata, Paragraph 0022, i.e., *Once a category is associated with the query, then the corresponding keywords and the ranked list of information sources are also associated with the query;* Paragraph 0023, i.e., *The keywords are sent to information sources and the returned results are analyzed for ranking*);

(ii) "storing the new result set and the search query in an offline-accessible data store" (Baidya, Paragraph 0151, i.e., Paragraph 0515, i.e., *a BioZak InfoBase CD containing data and instructions;* and Paragraph 0151, i.e., *allows users to search for information* ***offline***); and

(iii) "indexing the result and the search query for subsequent retrieval of the new result set" (Baidya, Paragraph 0050, i.e., *thereafter, categorize and index the information for storage in the InfoBase*).

As per claim 14, Doganata teaches the limitation:

"wherein receiving a new result set comprises performing a search for articles in response to the search query" (Doganata, Paragraph 0023, i.e., *The keywords are sent to information sources and the returned results are analyzed for ranking*).

As per claim 15, Doganata in view of Simmons and further in view of Baidya teaches the limitation:

" wherein storing the new result set and the search query in an offline-accessible data store comprises at least one of the following: storing the result set on an optical disc, storing the result set on a hard drive, storing the result set on an external data storage medium, storing the result set on an external data storage reader, and storing the result set on a data store on the client-side" (Baidya, Paragraph 0515, i.e., *a BioZak InfoBase CD containing data and instructions;* and Paragraph 0151, i.e., *allows users to search for information* ***offline***).

Claim 20 is essentially the same as claim 4 except that it set forth the claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

Claim 21 is essentially the same as claim 5 except that it set forth the claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

As per claim 22, Doganata in view of Simmons and further in view of Baidya teaches the limitation:

" wherein the program code for retrieving a previously stored result set associated with the search query comprises at least one of the following: program code

for retrieving the result set from an optical disc, program code for retrieving a result set from a hard drive, program code for retrieving the result set from an external data storage medium, program code for retrieving a result set from an external data storage reader, and program code for retrieving a result set from a data store on the client-side" (Baidya, Paragraph 0151, i.e., *a BioZak InfoBase CD containing data and instructions).*

As per claim 23, Doganata in view of Simmons and further in view of Baidya teaches the limitation:

"wherein the program code for receiving a search query comprises at least one of the following: program code for receiving the search query from a user operating an offline client-side device, program code for receiving the search query from a user operating an online client-side device" (Baidya, Paragraph 0515, i.e., *a BioZak InfoBase CD containing data and instructions;* and Paragraph 0151, i.e., *allows users to search for information* ***offline).***

Claim 27 is essentially the same as claim 11 except that it set forth the claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

Claim 30 is essentially the same as claim 14 except that it set forth the claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

Claim 31 is essentially the same as claim 27 except that it set forth the claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

4. Claims 29 and 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doganata in view Simmons and further in view of Baidya and further in view of Denny et al., (hereinafter "Denny") (U.S. Patent Number 7082428).

As per claim 29, Doganata in view of Simmons and further in view of in view of Baidya does not explicitly teach the limitation: "comparing the search query to a list of previously received search queries"

On the other hand, Denny teaches the limitation:

"comparing the search query to a list of previously received search queries" (Denny, Abstract).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of comparing current queries to pervious queries, as taught by Denny, to the method of Doganata in view of Simmons and further in view of in view of Baidya so that the resultant method would compare current queries to the previous queries. One would have been motivated to do so in order to do away with *multiple duplicative searches* (Denny, Column 1 Lines 62-67).

As per claim 34, Doganata in view of Simmons and further in view of in view of Baidya and further in view of Denny teaches the limitations:

(a) "receiving a search query" (Doganata, Figure 1: USER I/F 105 *and PERSONAL QUERY MANAGER 110 ;* and Paragraph 0022, i.e., *new user queries are generated, information sources are queried)* ;

(b) "determining whether the search query has been previously received" (Doganata, Paragraph 0033, i.e., ***If** the user has **previously used this query** within the context of "computer language",;* and Paragraph 0022, i.e., *The new user query may be based on **a previously entered user query**, which is given its own personal category or is related to a general category. **If the user enters a user query that has no corresponding category**, then it is beneficial to associate a category to the query. Once a category is associated with the query, then the corresponding keywords and the ranked list of information sources are also associated with the query;* and Paragraph 0036, i.e., *If there is no match;* and Denny, Abstract, i.e., *An application server compares an entered query with the previously executed queries. If the application server finds a query that is substantially similar to the entered query, the application server returns the results corresponding to the previously executed query. If no substantially similar result is found, the query is executed against one or more data sources*);

(c) "if the search query has not been previously received,

(i) receiving the first result set" (Denny, Abstract, i.e., *An application server compares an entered query with the previously executed queries. If the application*

server finds a query that is substantially similar to the entered query, the application server returns the results corresponding to the previously executed query. If no substantially similar result is found, the query is executed against one or more data sources);

(ii) "storing the first result set in an offline-accessible data store" (Baidya, Paragraph 0151); and

(iii) "indexing the first result set for subsequent retrieval" (Baidya, Paragraph 0151); and

(d) "if the search query has been previously received" (Denny, Abstract,),

(i) "retrieving a previously stored result set associated with the search query" (Doganata, Paragraph 0022, i.e., *If the user has previously used this query within the context of "computer language," then* ***only "computer languages" is returned*** *as the category*);

(il) "determining whether at least a portion of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is a valid search result for the search query" (Doganata, Paragraph 0024, i.e., *The present invention overcomes a problem with metasearch systems. As explained previously, a metasearch system sends a query to a multitude of information sources and the results are grouped and merged. The results are either arranged based on the original scores of the documents or are grouped based on the search engine. If the relevance of these information sources and their categories to the query is not known, the returned results are usually not satisfactory. By ranking the information sources, the present invention has the ability to return* ***a***

higher percentage of relevant documents *to the user in a faster fashion. In other words, embodiments of the present invention can determine that several information sources return more relevant documents. If these information sources are searched first, then the results placed highest in a list of returned documents will generally be more pertinent than the results obtained by the metasearch system;* and *Paragraph* 0022, i.e., *Furthermore, queries may be generated automatically from the keywords that represent a category to determine* ***the rank of*** *an information source. The keywords are sent to information sources and the returned results are analyzed for rankings. Each category is associated with a number of keywords, and the query is determined from the keywords corresponding to the category;* Note that by ranking of the results according their relevance and returning a higher percentage of relevant documents, the method of Doganata is essentially determining how large a portion of a category of searched results are relevant to the query. Therefore, the method is determining whether a portion of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is a valid result set for the search query. Also Note Paragraph 0039 of Doganata for this limitation, i.e., *document analyzer 150;* Simmons, Abstract, i.e., *A received communication signal is stored in a memory and* ***portions*** *thereof are read from the memory and monitored to detect the sync signal. When a detected sync signal* ***is determined to be invalid****, previously read portions of the received communication signal, preferably beginning at a portion of the received signal immediately after a start of the detected sync signal, are again read and monitored to detect the sync signal;* Simmons, Column 6 Line 57 through Column 7 Line 6, i.e., *As will be apparent to those*

skilled in the art, sync signal detectors typically perform correlations between received data and an expected sync signal or pattern, such as the FS pattern described above, ***to produce a probability output indicative of the likelihood that a portion of received data is a valid sync signal***);

(iil) "if the at least a portion of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is determined to be a valid search result set for the search query, outputting the portion of the previously stored result set" (Doganata, Paragraph 0024, Paragraph 0022, and Paragraph 0039; Simmons, Abstract, i.e., *A received communication signal is stored in a memory and* ***portions*** *thereof are read from the memory and monitored to detect the sync signal. When a detected sync signal* ***is determined to be invalid****, previously read portions of the received communication signal, preferably beginning at a portion of the received signal immediately after a start of the detected sync signal, are again read and monitored to detect the sync signal;* Simmons, Column 6 Line 57 through Column 7 Line 6, i.e., *As will be apparent to those skilled in the art, sync signal detectors typically perform correlations between received data and an expected sync signal or pattern, such as the FS pattern described above,* ***to produce a probability output indicative of the likelihood that a portion of received data is a valid sync signal***); and

(iv) "if the at least a portion of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is determined not to be a valid search result set for the search query" (Doganata Paragraph 0022, i.e., *The new user query may be based on* ***a previously entered user query****, which is given its own personal category or is related*

to a general category. ***If the user enters a user query that has no corresponding category****, then it is beneficial to associate a category to the query. Once a category is associated with the query, then the corresponding keywords and the ranked list of information sources are also associated with the query;* and Paragraph 0036, i.e., *If there is no match;* Simmons, Abstract, i.e., *A received communication signal is stored in a memory and* ***portions*** *thereof are read from the memory and monitored to detect the sync signal. When a detected sync signal* ***is determined to be invalid****, previously read portions of the received communication signal, preferably beginning at a portion of the received signal immediately after a start of the detected sync signal, are again read and monitored to detect the sync signal;* Simmons, Column 6 Line 57 through Column 7 Line 6, i.e., *As will be apparent to those skilled in the art, sync signal detectors typically perform correlations between received data and an expected sync signal or pattern, such as the FS pattern described above,* ***to produce a probability output indicative of the likelihood that a portion of received data is a valid sync signal****),

(1) "receiving the second result set" (Denny, Abstract; The method of Denny can retrieve as many results sets as necessary);

(2) "storing the second result set in an offline-accessible data store" (Baidya, Paragraph 0151); and

(3) "indexing the second result set for subsequent retrieval" (Baidya, Paragraph 0151).

As per claim 35, Doganata in view of Simmons and further in view of in view of Baidya and further in view of Denny teaches the limitation:

"wherein determining whether a search query has been previously received comprises comparing the search query to a list of previously received search queries" (Denny, Abstract, i.e., *An application server compares an entered query with the previously executed queries. If the application server finds a query that is substantially similar to the entered query, the application server returns the results corresponding to the previously executed query. If no substantially similar result is found, the query is executed against one or more data sources*).

As per claim 36, Doganata in view of Simmons and further in view of in view of Baidya and further in view of Denny teaches the limitation:

"wherein determining whether at least a portion of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is a valid search result set for the search query comprises determining at least **one of the following**: determining that a portion of the previously result set is new, determining that a portion of the previously stored result set includes a change, determining that a new article exists in a category of the previously stored result set, determining that a new article has been received in a category of the previously stored result set, determining that an article has been changed in the previously stored result set, determining that a new email has been received in a category of the previously stored result set, determining that a new email has been sent in a category of the previously stored result set, determining that a new

web page has been received in a category of the previously stored result set, determining that a web page has been changed in a category of the previously stored result set, determining that a new document has been received in a category of the previously stored result set, and determining that a new document has been generated in a category of the previously stored result set" (Doganata, Paragraph 0046, i.e., *The information source analyzer 160 sends the ranked list 161 of information sources 180 to the linguistic library 170, along with the associated query and category. When the linguistic library 170 receives the ranked list of information sources 180 through link 161, the linguistic library 170 updates the category with the ranked list 161 of information sources 180, as described below in reference to FIG. 3*). Note that the category is updated because new set of results from the information source analyzer includes changes. Simmons, Abstract, i.e., *A received communication signal is stored in a memory and* ***portions*** *thereof are read from the memory and monitored to detect the sync signal. When a detected sync signal* ***is determined to be invalid****, previously read portions of the received communication signal, preferably beginning at a portion of the received signal immediately after a start of the detected sync signal, are again read and monitored to detect the sync signal;* Simmons, Column 6 Line 57 through Column 7 Line 6, i.e., *As will be apparent to those skilled in the art, sync signal detectors typically perform correlations between received data and an expected sync signal or pattern, such as the FS pattern described above,* ***to produce a probability output indicative of the likelihood that a portion of received data is a valid sync signal***),

(1) "receiving the second result set" (Denny, Abstract; The method of Denny can retrieve as many results sets as necessary);

(2) "storing the second result set in an offline-accessible data store" (Baidya, Paragraph 0151).

5. Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doganata in view Simmons and further in view of Baidya and further in view of Rivers-Moore et al, (hereinafter "Rivers", U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2004/0267813).

As per claim 33, Doganata in view Simmons and further in view of Baidya teaches the limitations:

"receiving a request for an article, the article being accessible via a network" (Doganata, Figure 1; Paragraph 0028, i.e., *Internet databases, Internet search engines or public or private databases)*;

"determining whether the article is valid" (Doganata, Paragraph 0033, i.e., ***If*** *the user has* ***previously used this query*** *within the context of "computer language"*);

"if the article is determined not to be valid, retrieving the article via the network" (Doganata, Paragraph 0024, Paragraph 0022, and Paragraph 0039, i.e., if the query is new, that is, the query was not entered/received before; See claim 1 for details);

"retrieving the article via the network" (Doganata, Paragraph 0024, Paragraph 0022, and Paragraph 0039);

"outputting the article on the client device" (Doganata, Paragraph 0024, i.e., *the present invention has the ability to return* ***a higher percentage of relevant documents*** *to the user*);

"if the article is not stored in the offline-accessible data store" (Baidya, Paragraph 0050k i.e., *Back-End Processing Engine*). Note that most of Baidya's method and system are implemented online, i.e., data is not stored in offline-accessible. Only in Paragraph 0515, Baidya recites an alternative embodiment wherein data is stored in offline-accessible store.

Doganata in view Simmons and further in view of Baidya not explicitly teach the limitations:

"determining whether the article is stored in an offline-accessible data store associated with the client device"; and "if the article is stored in an offline-accessible data store"; and "retrieving the article from the offline-accessible data store";

Rivers teaches the limitations:

"determining whether the article is stored in an offline-accessible data store associated with the client device" (Rivers Paragraph 0088, i.e., *determine if the solution is available locally for offline use*); and

"if the article is stored in an offline-accessible data store"; and "retrieving the article from the offline-accessible data store" (Rivers Paragraph 0089, i.e., *to determine if the solution 124 is on the computer (cached or available offline) and access the solution*).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of determining whether data is stored in an offline-accessible or not, as taught by Rivers, to the method and system of Doganata in view of Simmons and further in view of Baidya so that the resultant method and system would determine if the data is stored in offline store or not. One would have been motivated to do so in order to efficiently gather electronic information (Rivers, Paragraph 0011).

6. Claims 12, 16, 28, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doganata in view of Simmons and further in view of Baidya and further in view Shaath et al., (hereinafter "Shaath") (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 20060010150).

As per claim 12, Doganata in view Simmons and further in view of Baidya does not explicitly teach the limitation: "determining expiration data for the result set".

Shaath teaches the limitation: "determining expiration data for the result set" (Paragraph 0030, i.e., *it will expire;* Paragraph 0102, *expiration dates;* and Paragraph0104, i.e. *To determine the expiration date).*

At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of determining expiration data, taught by Shaath, to method of Doganata in view of Simmons and further in view of Baidya so that the resultant method would determine expiration data. One would have been motivated to do so because determining expiration data is notoriously well know in the art.

As per claim 16, Doganata in view Simmons and further in view of Baidya and further in view of Shaath teaches the limitation:

"wherein (f) determining expiration data for the result set comprises determining expiration data for at least a portion of the result set, and displaying the expiration data for the at least a portion of the result set" (Shaath, Paragraph 0102, *expiration dates;* and Paragraph0104, i.e. *To determine the expiration date;* and 0032, i.e., *completely transparent to the user*).

Claim 28 is essentially the same as claim 12 except that it set forth the claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

Claim 32 is essentially the same as claim 16 except that it set forth the claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

Contact Information

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dennis Myint whose telephone number is (571) 272-5629. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5:30PM Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Dennis Myint
Examiner
AU-2162

SA

JOHN BREENE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100